

# THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

CLIV. Vol. VI.—No. 22.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29TH, 1845.

[PRICE 4d.]

## FRENCH LAW ON SLAVERY. DISCUSSION IN THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

May 29, 1845.

M. JOLLIVET, delegate from Martinique, opened the discussion by speaking against the *projet de loi*. In a long and tiresome speech, delivered in the midst of many interruptions and marks of disapprobation, he employed the usual commonplaces, and nothing more.

The MINISTER OF MARINE replied. M. Jollivet had represented the *projet de loi* as imposed by a foreign government. But this allegation could not be seriously maintained, since the idea of the projected ameliorations had been entertained by the Government for a considerable number of years. The Chamber would perceive that, in the plan under consideration, the only essential element was the necessity of terminating in the colonies a mischievous and precarious state of things, compromising the interests of all parties. What was intended for the welfare of the slaves was not less necessary to the interest of the planters, whose cause it was not requisite there to defend. He therefore most earnestly repelled the imputation that the Government had not acted in a free and independent manner.

M. TERNAUX COMPANS.—He would not speak of the general motives for the abolition of slavery, which had often been stated in the Chamber, and always with its approbation. Nor would he follow M. Jollivet in what he had said of the Colonial Councils, whose resistance would be renewed with every effort to ameliorate the condition of the slave. He thought it necessary that the Minister of Marine should say how he understood their rights. This would put an end to a very mischievous report, namely, that the resistance of the Colonial Councils was favoured by the Government; that it had been said to them, Here we are obliged to make concessions; but oppose them, and we shall not insist on them. What tended to show that this was not without foundation was, that, notwithstanding the urgency of the magistrates, the Minister of Marine had never consented to attach a penal sanction to the ordinance for the inspection and protection of slaves. He thought the time for emancipation was come. The English islands were but a few leagues from theirs: would it not be easy to transport arms in the night? But there was no war now. In the time of peace, however, we should prepare for war. The present state of things was extremely precarious. Many persons feared that, in case of emancipation, labour would cease; but now there was no security against an insurrection of the slaves. Who would lay out money in such a state of things? All endeavours to direct capital towards the West Indies had completely failed. The colonists were overwhelmed with debt; and others who had money thought it more prudent to keep it at home. It was so very necessary to do something for the colonies, that he should support the *projet de loi* although he thought it a bad one. Many objections had been raised against emancipation. First, the resistance of the colonists. But this was because most of them were so deeply in debt, and now they could laugh at their creditors. Nothing could be worse for them than a settlement of any kind. They were only seeking to gain time. It was said that the negroes were not prepared for freedom, that they must be instructed. Very good in theory; but who was to do it? The clergy did not. The master would not. The funds allowed by the State were misapplied. Instead of building chapels, they had only repaired the cathedral at Point à Pitre; and in the schools which had been opened it had been forbidden to receive slaves. From the beginning, the ministry of marine, instead of seeing in emancipation a great work to be done, had regarded it only as an embarrassing question to be got rid of. And after various expedients, they brought forward this *projet de loi*, which was worth nothing. There were many objections to it. Its execution presented great difficulties. All codes regulated the relations of persons one to another, and the rights of persons to things: but this law would create a new kind of being, one who had not yet become a person, although he had ceased to be a thing. Again, by this law the slave could make a will. He could not write; and who could be his witnesses, if his fellow-slaves might not? Suppose a slave put money into the hand of his master. He took security on the property on which he was a slave, that is on himself, so that he might be obliged to sell himself in order to pay himself. (Laughter.) Or upon a note of hand, could a slave arrest his master? With the single exception of the right of purchasing his freedom, the *projet de loi* conferred nothing on the slave which he did not possess by former ordinances, which have not been executed. As to the right of redemption, he had calculated how long, under the most favourable circumstances, it would take a slave to purchase himself. It would require fifty years. (Hear.) The speaker then gave his calculation in detail. He was reminded that the negroes had money already. Some of them had so, and this was one of the reasons why he should vote for the *projet de loi*. But for the future the saving of money would be impossible.

M. DE CASTELLANE.—Why? There is no alteration.

M. TERNAUX COMPANS.—At present the kindness of rich proprietors allowed a multitude of little advantages to the slaves, especially when it cost them nothing. Besides which, it was the interest of the proprietors that the slaves should acquire property, that they might be better satisfied with their situation. But, by this *projet*, the state of things would be changed, and it would become the interest of the master that the slave should have no property, because he would employ it to buy his freedom. Exasperation, however, must be avoided, and perhaps the masters might not dare to withhold from the slaves all means of acquiring property: they might fear negro insurrections, and, above all, poison. The last was a subject of frightful apprehension in the West Indies; so much so that it might be said that the colonial regime was, the whip, restrained by poison. But if a master would not dare to hinder a slave from acquiring property, he would encourage him to spend it. Now he did what he could to prevent a slave from getting drunk; but hereafter he would establish rum-shops in the neighbourhood, where all the earnings of the week would be spent on the Sunday. Suppose, however, that the negro defies all these difficulties, and acquires property, he is not much the better, since conditions are imposed upon him which he cannot fulfil. He must prove that he has come honestly by it. This might be done with movable property, but how was it to be done with money? A commission would be appointed to regulate the value of slaves. How was the negro to get at the commission? Would they go from parish to parish once or twice a year, or was the negro to go to them? Nothing could be easier than for the master to hinder him. Besides, they might set such a price on a negro that he could not pay it. He had heard of from 30,000 to 40,000 francs being demanded for a negro who earned 50 francs a year. The minister, indeed, undertook to fix a maximum; but the maximum would thenceforth become the minimum. Another difficulty was, that slaves unacquainted with legal proceedings would not know how to obtain their liberation in a valid manner. At last the slave would have overcome all these difficulties. He would suppose him to have begun at twenty-five years of age. It had taken him fifty years to acquire his property. To get through minor difficulties would have taken him five years. He had come to buy himself. This venerable octogenarian would be obliged to contract a new engagement for five years, for fear his youthful follies should disturb the colony. (Laughter.) Carpenters and other tradesmen might find engagements; but what was the mere labourer to do? His late master would not have him. The other proprietors would not have him. The Government had so clearly seen this that, in the second *projet de loi*, they had set apart funds for forming establishments to employ the redeemed slaves. This might be done, if, as he expected, they should be few; but if they should be many!—He had said enough to show that the law was ill-conceived: why then did he vote for it? Because he thought the worst scheme of emancipation with the concurrence of the colonists better than the best without it. Hitherto the colonists had been deceived by the indecision of the Government, and by reports from Paris: he hoped they would now see that something would be done. His second reason was, because there were 1,200 negroes belonging to the Government who would be made free, and perhaps a thousand who had money enough to purchase themselves. He would not retard their liberation. (Hear.)

May 31.

M. LEVAYASSEUR spoke against the *projet de loi*. If the point under discussion was the defence of slavery, he would at all risks go over to the camp of liberty. But they were discussing a mixed state, which he thought mischievous while a system of free labour was not organised. Hitherto all had been patriarchal kindness; now there would be nothing but constables and assize courts.

M. DE TOCQUEVILLE.—The *projet* had hitherto been very unfortunate. It had been attacked by some as too powerful, by others as having no power at all. He thought both were mistaken. The law was not a scheme of emancipation. The rights given by it were illusory; in this view he entirely agreed with M. Ternaux Compans. Nevertheless he thought that, in respect of emancipation, it was eminently useful, or rather necessary. It did not emancipate, but it did that without which emancipation could not take place; it took the great question of the abolition of slavery into the hands of the Government. This was the chief effect of the law, and he hoped it would pass without amendment, that it might be sure of being added to their codes this year. A previous speaker had cited what he had formerly written, and what he still maintained; that while the two races were face to face without any one to separate them, there was but one issue, of which the terms were servitude or extinction. (Hear.) It was for this reason that he thought it a necessary preliminary of emancipation to place the Government in a position of supremacy. With the preceding speaker, he wished that this change should take place with the concurrence of

SPASPER  
REPORTER  
ANTI-SLAVERY



the colonists; but experience led him to despair of it. Everything had been done to obtain their concurrence, but all had been met with stubborn opposition. It would still be so; and the Chamber ought to know that the colonists denied to the entire French Government the right of taking this great work into its hands. When yesterday an honourable delegate from the colonies said that they appealed to the legislative power of France, he said what was contrary to fact, and even to the very words recently adopted by the Colonial Council of Martinique, no longer ago than October last:—"It is to the Colonial Councils, composed of men having that local knowledge which alone qualifies men to conduct affairs, that the work of modification ought entirely to be referred. It would be a political wrong and a denial of justice to see a change effected by the mere will of the Government, or by the moral incompetence of the Chambers. We recognise in this matter no competence but that of the Colonial Councils." Did he mean to bring an accusation against the Colonial Councils? No. They acted very naturally. They followed all the examples in history. The most deplorable effect of inequality of conditions, when it had lasted a long while, was to persuade the master himself that he might continue a tyrant and yet remain an honest man. Was this peculiar to their colonies? No. He had seen the same result in the United States. But the supremacy of the law must be established, and this was the precise effect of the *projet* now before them. One word on the question of humanity. It had been often said that slavery was very much mitigated. He asked how slavery could be mitigated, since the slave was but a kind of domestic animal. If it was true, as was constantly repeated, that the whites in the colonies were every day getting poorer and poorer, how could the slaves be more happy? Besides, it was a truth as ancient as the world, that every government became more severe the more it was contested: how then could slavery become more mild? If slavery had become more mild in some points, it had become more rigorous in others. But, if slavery be more severe, enfranchisements are more numerous. The number of enfranchisements, however, diminishes. In 1840, there were 1,900; in 1844, 1,400. The increase or decrease of numbers showed more distinctly than all other things the state of a people. Now, there were found among the blacks, 7,000 births annually, and 8,000 deaths. Among the slaves in the United States, population increased rapidly; and in Saint Domingo it had nearly doubled in thirty years. He would advert to political considerations. The dangers of emancipation had been spoken of: he wished some one would describe the dangers, or rather the impossibilities, of the *statu quo*. What did their colonies say of themselves? That production diminished, industry was extinct, credit disappeared, and the bonds of society were relaxed. A speaker, yesterday, had said that the colonial system was tyranny restrained by poison. This was true. At this moment the colonies are in a state of social dissolution. Why? Many reasons have been assigned, but this comprehends them all; the colonies have before them no fixed prospect. Both the master and the slave perceive on the horizon, and that a near one, an approaching revolution. Imagine what a similar expectation would produce in France. Just such was the state of the colonies, and while it continued such nothing else could be expected. Such a state was not only bad in itself, it could last but a few years. It would terminate with the first war. It had been said that the effect of war would be to deliver up the colonies to England; but he did not think so. To defend their colonies against the English, they would be obliged to effect the immediate and abrupt abolition of slavery. Could such a *statu quo* be accepted? He thought not. He was profoundly convinced that, for the sake of the whites themselves, emancipation must be proceeded with. But could it be usefully done? He thought it could, although he should not then attempt to prove it. He knew that what had happened in the English colonies was made an objection. If he wished to cite an example of great events being distorted by private interests, he would take the emancipation of the English colonies. He had heard it said yesterday that the English colonies were ruined and expiring—assertions which might be made, but which could not be sustained. It was clear, from the speeches of the first men in Parliament, that if British emancipation has not fully realized the hopes of abolitionists, it has exceeded the reasonable expectations of statesmen. The result was this. That had been effected in the English colonies which had never before been seen in the world. A million of men had been suddenly elevated from slavery to freedom without shedding one drop of blood. (Hear.) Not only had there been no riot, no civil war; there had not been a single murder. This was not all. These men who had been represented five or six years ago as a species intermediate between the man and the monkey, did they fly into the woods, as had been predicted? By no means. Among these unfortunates there had been made a movement towards civilization greater than any which had been effected among any enlightened people in the world. (Hear.) The mother country had as yet lost nothing, for England exported to these ruined colonies just the same quantity of merchandise as in 1831.

M. DE CASTELLANE.—The articles are different.

M. DE TOCQUEVILLE.—It was true there had been a decrease in certain kinds of colonial produce, but not to the extent stated. Some large proprietors had suffered in their fortunes severely, and property had become much more equally diffused than formerly; but nobody had been ruined. The production of sugar had diminished one-third; but this effect, instead of increasing, had been lessened every year. But which were the colonies that had most seriously felt this diminution of a single product? The large and populous ones, which bore no analogy to those of France. There were colo-

nies which had suffered nothing, and had even gained, in this respect. These were the smaller English colonies, strictly analogous to those which they wished to release from slavery. Some of them were till lately French, and still contain a French population. Nothing need hinder them from imitating English emancipation, without imitating its faults. It should even urge them onward; for the state of the English colonies was better than that of the French. On the moral question one word. In his eyes the question of abolition was for France, not merely one of interest, but one of honour. Emancipation was the product of a French idea. (Hear.) It was they who, by destroying throughout the world the principle of castes and classes, and diffusing universally the notion of the equality of men before the law, were the true authors of the abolition of slavery. It was they who had created the sentiment which the religious philanthropy of England had so nobly and so happily realized. (Hear.)

Rear-Admiral LE RAY praised the speech of M. Jollivet, and protested against the continuance of slavery. The question of emancipation had no adversaries: it remained only to fix the best moment and the best mode for enfranchising the slaves. He agreed with the Duke de Broglie, that slavery ought to be abolished as soon as it could be found compatible with the essential conditions of social order. The *projet de loi*, however, appeared to him to compromise these conditions. The colonies were not in want of laws and ordinances. What they wanted above all things was a charter, consented to by themselves, which should place them for a long while in security from the fluctuations which disturbed everything in the mother country. To say that a system more than two hundred years old should fall before laws annually voted, and ordinances made according to different theories successively in vogue, would be to devote their possessions beyond the sea to all the changeableness of the political systems which struggle in France. The colonies might be overthrown by the operation of these systems. Indeed, when they looked at the example of England, how could the King's Government, so wise hitherto, enter upon so perilous a career? They had already advanced far beyond the first *projet de loi* presented last year by the Minister of Marine to the Chamber of Peers. This new *projet* proved to those who, like himself, had been in the colonies, how much of the information was wanting in France which was necessary to frame so important a law. At this moment the Commission of the Chamber would have amended the *projet*, but they dare not, for fear of an adjournment. Already they have obtained a pledge of the emancipation of the Government slaves, and the Minister of Marine has not been afraid to promise it in five years. This is an important circumstance. It announces to the colonists that the Government have made up their minds to effect the great measure of emancipation in five years. Was not this like the orders in Council of November, 1831, which precipitated the English colonies into the abyss in which they have been swallowed up?

M. AGENOR DE GASPARIN said the debate must not be suffered to sink. Much had been said about commerce, navigation, and colonial produce; but there were other things in the law now submitted to them. (Hear.) He had understood M. Levasseur and Admiral le Ray to say that all were agreed, and that the whole Chamber was for the abolition of slavery. He had never heard a speech against emancipation which did not begin with a profession of faith in its favour. (Hear.) This was an illusion; they were not all agreed. He had seldom known persons who were really agreed on a principle differ much about details. It was evident that they differed, from the modes in which the question was put. They had just heard it stated, for example, that colonial produce and the export of sugar would be lessened, and this was to settle the question. He attached much importance to this view; but, if it were so, this would not, in his judgment, determine the question of principle. (Hear.) This was not the great aspect of the discussion. To restore freedom to those from whom it ought never to have been taken away, this was the essential matter. The question then presented itself under different aspects, according to which it would resolve itself differently; and yet they were all agreed! He could not concur in this untruth. Admiral le Ray had insisted that the condition of the slaves was as happy as that of French peasants.

A MEMBER.—It is more happy.

M. DE GASPARIN protested against this representation. He waited for the time when a free workman would request to be made a slave. Every free workman knew very well the difference between his own misfortune and a slave's happiness. It was with personal as with political freedom. When tyranny established itself at Rome there was resistance for a considerable time; but at length resistance died away, because degradation was complete. (Hear.) Such was the happiness of slavery. It was the most detestable of its fruits, the last degree of moral debasement to which a human being could be reduced. (Hear.) But it could be proved that even this melancholy happiness did not exist. Many facts demonstrated it. These happy creatures were sold in the market—they were making their escape on all sides. The island garrisons were doubled, and it was enacted by law that they should not possess boats, lest they should run away from the happiness so loudly vaunted. (Hear.) Their opponents said, "Take care of the whites; you have plenty of wretches around you without going to the West Indies." But who were they that took care of the whites? The same persons that took care of the blacks. Christian benevolence did not limit itself to a single region. The more it was exercised the more ardent it became. He should pity their own peasants, if there should be no longer any sympathy for the miseries which existed on the other



side of the Atlantic. (Hear.) There was a difference of opinion as to the honour of France. According to some, the honour of France consisted in repelling the Machiavellian intrigues of England—that was, in magnanimously prolonging a great crime, in having for accomplices the United States, Cuba, and Brazil! He thought otherwise. The honour of his country was to be just, to be generous, and to set a good example. If England had done a just action from interested motives, France should not renounce it on that account.

M. ODILLON BARROT.—You are right.

M. DE GASPARI.—The lamentations of the Colonial Councils had been dwelt upon. How often had they predicted the ruin of the colonies! It was to have resulted from the abolition of the slave-trade—from the law of 1833—from the ordinance on protection; but none of these prophecies had come to pass. What did the Colonial Councils complain of? That they could not set themselves to destroy slavery without saying hard things of it! But did they think that, because they resisted all energetic measures, no voice would be raised to say that the crime existed, and that its reparation was expected? The interest of the colonies had been spoken of. Even on this he differed widely from the opponents of the *projet de loi*. It had been said that the colonies were interested in maintaining the *statu quo*: but he denied it. The interest of the colonies was to know what the Government and the Chambers were determined to do. They should know at the same time that all their interests would be provided for. He applauded the second *projet de loi*. There was a great change to be effected in the colonies. They must not pursue the abolition of slavery alone, but must also introduce agricultural improvements, which might double, triple, or quadruple the produce, and so compensate the loss which might arise from emancipation. In this way the interests of the colonies might be promoted; but to say, "Do nothing," was to leave them in extreme difficulty. They had been told of the tranquillity of colonial society: yet the English islands near theirs were being peopled with fugitives. The defenders of the colonies imprudently hazarded a dangerous excitement, and exposed the masters to an abrupt emancipation, which the first war would bring about. The emancipation effected by England had not been successful in every respect. The production of sugar had diminished one-third; but she was in a way to recover herself in a few years. He quoted the declaration of Lord Stanley as to the moral and social result. They had been told that experience had given the lie to the abolitionists; he thought it had completely given the lie to the colonists. They had announced assassinations and the return of the blacks to savage life. Well, there had not been one drop of blood shed in Jamaica since emancipation, while, within thirty years preceding it, there had been five bloody revolts.

A MEMBER.—There has been one in Dominica.

M. DE GASPARI.—He knew it; but it should be treated leniently, as it arose out of the census. (Laughter.) Besides there had been no serious disturbance; only a slight disturbance, in which one or two negroes perished.

M. DE LA ROCHEFOUCAULD LIANCOURT.—Only one perished.

M. DE GASPARI then proceeded to quote at some length the English official documents on the results of emancipation, noticing particularly the effect of it in creating a body of small proprietors. He went on to say that the opponents of emancipation accused the Government of weakness in yielding to the impatience of the abolitionists. They had waited twelve years! But he would bring against the Government an opposite accusation: it had not been sufficiently decided. Admiral Roussin had written in 1839 that the time for emancipation was come: it was now 1845! The governor of Guadeloupe said in 1840 that in his opinion an early emancipation was necessary; and in 1844 the governor of Martinique announced that measures for emancipation would be undertaken. But what was going on now? The governor of Martinique had caused some parcels of pamphlets to be seized, because they contained the opinions of the abolitionists! He must then exclude all the journals, and even the *Moniteur* itself. (Hear.) He would state a fact still more grave. Measures were taken by the Privy Council, without any judicial act, to transport blacks from the French to the Spanish colonies, where he believed they were sold, and oxen and mules taken in exchange. (Hear.)

M. TERNAUX COMPANS.—This is slave-trading; the boats might be seized.

M. DE GASPARI.—It was slave-trading, trading in French slaves. They might be sold in French colonies; but to sell them to Spaniards, to separate them from their families, and to do this without the intervention of the tribunals, by the sole will of the governor, appeared to him monstrous. Yet he had the proof.

M. TERNAUX COMPANS.—Admiral Mackau has denied the fact.

M. DE GASPARI.—This was not the only case; and he mentioned them there, because he knew that to produce them in that tribune was to put a stop to them. (Hear, hear.) If there was one principle sanctioned by their ancient laws, it was the full right to freedom of slaves touching the French soil. He feared they were receding from this. This had occurred last year. Several slaves had appeared as witnesses before a French tribunal at Draguignan. They had been treated as slaves, permitted to go out of court as slaves, to traverse the soil of France as slaves; and they were slaves to this hour. (Hear, hear.) If they did nothing great for the future, let them at least maintain the rights of the past. England jealously maintained this right, and some slaves had lately been set free on touching at Zante. Greece had affirmed the same prin-

ciple. Was France alone going to renounce it? (Hear, hear.) He would return to the *projet de loi*. The Commission had intimated that it was not such as they could have wished. Several speakers had found fault with it. They had heard M. Ternaux's apology for it. (Laughter.) M. de Tocqueville had said he could support it only as introducing the principle of state interference between master and slave. Well, this *projet*, which every one disavowed, which no one would applaud, they were going to adopt without modification. He must explain himself on this point. The report had stated that what was desired was chiefly a moral effect. Now he asked whether, after the *projet* had been reported on and discussed as it had been, and amended as he hoped it would be, the moral effect would not be greater by its being referred to another place? (Hear.) Besides, the report had contained important promises. He accepted the promises, and was convinced that the accomplishment of them did not depend on the adoption of the *projet*. Whatever the law might be, freedom could not long be refused to the slaves. But they were not going to vote that report. What then would happen, if, according to the recommendation of the report, they voted the law without amendment? They would have merely the law itself; with the report of the Chamber of Peers on one side, saying that it leads to nothing, and the report of the Chamber of Deputies on the other side, saying exactly the contrary. (Hear.) It was said that his wish would be partly met by the important addition which allotted funds for the redemption of families. But even admitting (which he did not) that this amendment was all that could be desired, he asked why it was thrown into another *projet*? Probably because its adoption was doubtful in another place. They might vote the law, therefore, in prospect of an addition which would never pass. It was said, Take this law, because it is the best that can be obtained. He did not think so. The question of slavery pressed on the conscience of France, which must not be too easily relieved of its weight. If the law was adopted, it might be said, "We have done something, do not come soon for more." The country would think it had done its duty. He charged all to speak freely; since he had never seen a calculating silence, or the acceptance of unsatisfactory measures, successful in anything. (Hear.) He would give his idea of the law, if it was not modified, in two words. It recognized the right of property and of redemption. He did not deny that this was progress. But what would result from it? The slaves would lose all advantages now enjoyed by them, either through the liberality or the habits of their masters. As to redemption, no one could expect on the plan proposed to realize property enough in less than twenty-five or thirty years. Then the slave would have to prove that his property had been lawfully acquired;—and this of money which he had been collecting for thirty years! And when he presented himself before a commission consisting of planters and magistrates, they might say to him, You have valued yourself at so much: you are worth two, three, or four times as much! Even after this he would not be free: for five years he must work for a master as before. Would he then be free? No. He would then fall under a peculiar set of laws, and would be liable, without any fault, to be sent to work on a plantation for an unlimited period. Such was the *projet de loi*! (Hear, hear.) The measure made him afraid of two things. The first was, that the friends of emancipation would sign a lease of ten or twelve years in favour of slavery. (Hear.) The second was, that this law, although it would do no good, might do much evil. (Hear.) It would not confer freedom, but it would breed discontent. It would irritate everybody: the blacks, because it promised them freedom, and did not confer it; the colonists because it diminished their authority. Both parties would suffer; and in a year or two it might be said, to put an end to the disorder, Emancipate at once.

M. DE CASTELLANE.—And without paying for it.

M. DE GASPARI.—He wished emancipation, but not in that manner. He would not say, Do evil, that good may come. (Hear.) Neither would he conceal emancipation under measures of excessive prudence. His fears were not imaginary. Experience had spoken, and had been appealed to by M. Jollivet, with whom he agreed only in this point. "Your law," said he, "was the English order in Council of 1831." This was quite true. Now that order in Council had produced disorder, and led to a proposal of immediate emancipation in 1832. (Hear.) It was because he approved of the principle of the law that he wished it greatly amended. Enfranchisement by purchase was an excellent principle, but it must be applied with energy. Doubtless it was hard to say to the slaves, "You must buy yourselves;" but in this way liberty came into the world, and is still acquired. "The principle is good: and if you amend the law—if you give to the slaves the decided support of the Government; if you secure the redemption of entire families; if you encourage marriage and the formation of domestic ties; if you establish savings-banks in the colonies; if you suppress degrading punishments, especially of women; if you fix beforehand the price of the blacks; if you maintain the rightful possession of property, and give an entire freedom to the enfranchised, you will do much for emancipation. And if, at the same time, you assist agriculture, as I just now indicated, you will effect emancipation in a different way from England, and better than England. You will meet the demands at once of the slaves and of the colonists." (Hear, hear.)

M. DE MACKAU replied to M. Gasparin's assertion of the necessity of amendments in the *projet de loi*, by referring to the extreme prudence with which it was necessary to frame measures so deeply affecting the state of things in the colonies. The *projet* appeared to him to contain all that was essential at present, and he



thought that an attempt to gain more might risk the loss of what they had now in prospect.

Some conversation then took place respecting the transportation of slaves from the French islands to Cuba and Porto Rico, in which M. Ledru Rollin, M. de Mackau, and M. Ternaux Compans took part.

M. DE CARNE spoke in favour of the *projet*, and entreated M. de Gasparin to withdraw his amendments.

M. DE CASTILLANE viewed the question independently; he had no interest, and he had not read the colonists' pamphlets. Yet he was not an abolitionist. He thought the law contained the elements of emancipation without indemnity. Emancipation must be in the law, since everybody was obliged to say so, even those who, perhaps, did not think so. Besides, all the abolitionists voted for it, although they did not approve it. The *projet* would occasion much disquiet, and almost certain disorder, in the colonies. It was but a half measure. It created a middle state. It was agreed that emancipation should be effected; and then nothing was attended to but the amelioration of the condition of the slaves. Lord Bathurst's order in council of 1831 had occasioned an insurrection in Jamaica, suppressed only by torrents of blood. (Sensation.) And what was worse, at this period the moral progress which had been effected by the care of the missionaries, had been checked, and the negroes had retrograded towards barbarism. The inquiry before the House of Commons in 1832 proved this. The excitement was such that even the ministers themselves did not dare to give elementary instruction for fear of stimulating revolt. (Agitation.) England, in 1831, at the demand of a single member of parliament, had suddenly emancipated the blacks held by the Government. This act produced the last revolt in Jamaica, in which 500 blacks died on the scaffold. In France the Government had not made such a proposition; but the Commission had suggested it, and the Government had, with one small condition, complied. The analogy was complete, and the result would be the same. The result would be in part attributable to the detestable spirit of the colonists, which was to be deplored, and in that place to be censured. They would be perverse, absurd, and cruel, as the blacks would be ignorant, brutal, and savage. Had the colonists, had the slaves, created this antagonism? No: but slavery. It was the legacy of ages, aided by the mother country. When these difficulties were practically encountered, the Government would not know what to do, and would say, We can no longer preserve order in the colonies, some decisive step must be taken. This decisive step would be what the House of Commons found necessary in 1832, as the result of similar legislation. They must emancipate. But how? As the abolitionists meant, by giving 150, or even 80 millions? To whom? To ill-behaved colonists? Certainly not. Emancipate, if you must, but pay nothing to those who deserve nothing. Thus the law would lead to emancipation without indemnity. But emancipation without indemnity was revolution.

A VOICE, on the left: Not at all, with time.

M. DE CASTELLANE. It was impossible to maintain slavery. They must come to a law of emancipation. The responsibility of such a measure would be complete, and the Chamber would know what it was doing, whether rejecting it, or venturing on the difficult but glorious experiment. This could not be said of the measure, at once easy and rash, which was now before them. From the experience of England, the success of emancipation appeared certain as to the preservation of order, the improvement of the black race, the transition from slavery to liberty, and the change of the slave into a small proprietor; but all this on condition of simultaneous emancipation and indemnity. He would rather see the Government make a glorious attempt at emancipation, than bring forward this petty and dangerous measure.

M. GALOS, *commissaire du Roy*, replied to M. de Castellane, and advocated the *statu quo*.

M. LE MERCIER, formerly an officer of marine, spoke against the *statu quo*. Having thoroughly considered the matter, his choice had been made, without enthusiasm, and without hesitation. He promised to the Government his feeble support whenever they should bring forward a measure of emancipation.

M. ISAMBERT, in replying to M. de Castellane, did not mean to combat his abolitionist sentiments. He also desired that the Government would bring forward a law for abolition; but since they had not thought circumstances sufficiently favourable, what ought genuine abolitionists to do? He could not agree with M. de Castellane, since that course would indefinitely postpone the question, and he thought the time was come when something ought to be done. It was France that ought to have occupied herself, in the first instance, with the emancipation of the blacks. It had been said that it was an English idea. But was it English writers, or Montesquieu, who had so keenly rebuked the abominations of slavery? Was it not at the opening of the States General, May 5, 1789, that M. Necker came, for the first time, to appeal to the compassion of France on behalf of the miserable blacks? And were not the labours of the Constituent Assembly advances towards the abolition of slavery? Subsequent events, and especially the war which broke out, had not permitted the realization of this design. As to St. Domingo, it was not the National Convention which caused the bloodshed in that colony, but the planters, who summoned the blacks to arms in order to resist the mother country. It was Napoleon, whose policy was too often lauded, who, instead of maintaining the abolition of slavery, strove to re-establish slavery itself. It had

cost seas of blood to re-establish slavery in Guadeloupe. They had had the merit of originating this grand idea, and he would not ask the Minister of Marine, now that he had brought forward a *projet de loi*, to postpone it, although he did not deem it sufficient. Yet he was persuaded that, if the ministry would be firm, and would select proper officers, not under the influence of the Colonial Councils, the law, however imperfect, would be successful. It had been said that the law breathed mistrust of the colonists. But the colonists themselves had proposed the right of redemption and property in 1836. They had a right to be mistrustful of the Colonial Councils, for their opposition was obstinate and invincible. He did not believe that the Colonial Councils truly represented colonial opinion. They were an aristocracy, like that which, before 1798, possessed feudal rights. They were actuated less by a sentiment of interest, than by one of prejudice and pride. But there was another class in the colonies who might render great service to the Government in this affair. He referred not only to the persons of colour, but also to other inhabitants who would voluntarily associate themselves with the Government, and support the Governors in such measures as must be adopted. It had just been said that they would bring about emancipation without indemnity. But would not redemption at the cost of the slave be more profitable to the colonists than emancipation with indemnity? He hoped the minister would, in respect of redemption, take all necessary precautions; for it was to be feared that coalitions would be formed among the proprietors, as in the English colonies, and that, unless a minimum was fixed, and a disinterested commission appointed, together with a majority of magistrates from the mother country, they would not arrive at satisfactory results. Coalitions among the colonists had been spoken of. No doubt they would resort to all sorts of chicanery; but he thought there was safety against this danger. If slaves enough were not emancipated under this law, escapes of slaves would become more numerous than ever. It would not require war to effect emancipation. If the Swedish island of St. Bartholomew should become free (and this would soon be the case), this would encourage escapes. If an English company should send a sloop along the shore in the night, notwithstanding the surveillance kept up at a great expense nothing could hinder the escape of slaves by thousands. The colonists were therefore surrounded by dangers, and must know that, if they made an ill-advised opposition to freedom, they might lose their property entirely. As to insurrections, he did not anticipate them. He believed that the declarations made in that tribune would prevent them. It was because the question of emancipation was agitated, that tranquillity reigned in the colonies. This measure consequently would tend to reunite the people. It would be the beginning of a general emancipation; and, if an unfortunate black could not get money to redeem himself, he would learn that the mother country would come to his aid, and that successive grants from the budget would enable all good subjects to become free. The law had been reproached with being a measure of emancipation. It was as such they accepted it. Had it been only a measure for laying the matter to sleep, they should have voted against it. But neither the Chambers nor the Government meant this. The Chamber of Peers had adopted the law as one for emancipation, and in the Chamber of Deputies the indications were still more positive. On the one hand the Minister of Marine had engaged to emancipate the blacks belonging to the Government. Five years had been spoken of; but he hoped it would be done in much less time. After this the colonists would see that emancipation was coming. On the whole, he thought it was best to accept the law as it was.

M. JULES DE LASTEYRIE, on the part of the commission, summed up the discussion.

#### ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING AT BANBURY.

(From the *Banbury Guardian*.)

A NUMBER of persons assembled, by special invitation, in the Friends' Meeting House, on Monday evening last, to hear a statement from Mr. Joseph Sturge of Birmingham, on this subject. There are few persons, we believe we might say none, who have evinced a more determined and consistent opposition to negro slavery in all its phases than has Joseph Sturge. His visit to the western hemisphere must be fresh in the recollection of all our readers who have taken an interest in the condition of the coloured population. By that visit he has added much to our previous knowledge of that condition, particularly in the United States, and enlarged his own ability to speak practically on a subject which has long occupied the attention of the religious community with which he is more immediately connected, as well as that of the Christian philanthropist of every creed. Joseph Ashbey Gillett, Esq., presided; and we were agreeably surprised to find that George William Alexander was also present. Both Mr. Sturge and Mr. Alexander addressed the meeting at some length, and invited observations and questions. Several gentlemen availed themselves of the invitation, and obtained what we judged to be satisfactory replies. Much that was narrated was familiar; we were glad to hear that there is a probability of the professedly Christian churches in America, hitherto holding slaves as common or church property, abandoning the abominable practice. Mr. Sturge announced an attempt that is being made in Manchester to establish a manufactory of cotton goods from the free grown cotton of the East Indies. He anticipates that the object will be carried out; and impressed upon the meeting the important effect which the success of the attempt must have upon the slavery question in North America. It was likely the article might not at first be so good at the price, as that produced from the slave-grown cotton, but he hoped the satisfaction that must be felt by those purchasing it, that they were not participating in the wrongs done to the slave, would be



considered more than an equivalent for any little extra cost. The addresses of both Mr. Sturge and Mr. Alexander were listened to with much attention, and seemed to excite considerable interest: the feeling of the meeting was evidently with the speakers.

A meeting of a similar character to the foregoing was held a few days previously, at which Messrs. J. Sturge and W. Alexander were present, with similar results.—Ed.

## NOTICES.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER is an Evening Paper, published on alternate Wednesdays, and may be had of all News-venders throughout the country. Price 4d., or 8s. 8d. per annum. A few complete volumes are on hand.

Subscriptions and Donations to the Society should be forwarded to the Treasurer, (G. W. Alexander, Esq.) at the Society's Office, 27, New Broad-street, London.

All Communications for the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* must be sent to the Office of the Society, as above.

## The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, OCTOBER 29, 1845.

OUR well known fellow labourers, Messrs. Josiah and William Forster and George Stacy, being now on a religious visit to the Friends in the state of Indiana, U.S., we find the following notice of them copied into the *Liberator* :—

"SUSPECTED ABOLITIONISTS.—Four individuals, clad in the Quaker garb, who recorded their names as Josiah Foster, William Foster, George Stacy, and John Allen, arrived here and put up at Mr. Cowton's hotel on Saturday evening last, and busied themselves during the greater part of the following day in calling at the dwellings of our free-coloured population. Their excessive familiarity with the negroes excited no little attention. Their conduct was of such a character as to induce the belief that they were the agents of some abolition society. A gentle hint was given them, that it would be advisable for them to make their stay in town as short as possible. They left, taking the western route, the following morning. It is supposed by some, that they are the Committee appointed by the General Convention of the Abolitionists of England, which assembled several weeks since in the city of London, to visit this country and gather all the information in their power concerning the negro population of the States—doubtless with a view to the establishment of a system, on an extensive scale, whereby slaves may be abducted from their masters."—*Cumberland Allegation*.

FROM the *Abolitioniste Francais* for July, August, and September, which we have just received, we are enabled to lay before our readers an abstract of the debate which took place in the French Chamber of Deputies on the *projet de loi* for the regulation of the colonies; or, in other words, for ameliorating the condition of the slaves. An account of the principal features of this measure was given in our number of June 25, and an abstract of the debate in the Chamber of Peers in that of July 9. In the Chamber of Deputies the discussion was commenced on the 29th of May by M. Jollivet, who, of course, spoke against the measure, which, as the delegate from Martinique, he was well paid for doing. He added nothing to the commonplaces usually employed by the advocates of slavery, and the Chamber heard him with impatience. The debate was continued by M. Ternaux Compans, who, after finding many and very just faults in the *projet*, gave it nevertheless his warm support. On the 31st, the discussion was resumed by M. Levassasseur, who condemned the measure, because, by giving *rights* to the slave, it would supersede the patriarchal kindness which had hitherto characterized the proceedings of the master. M. de Tocqueville followed, and was heard by the Chamber with distinguished attention. After touching on various topics, the speaker adverted to the results of British emancipation, which he exhibited with great force and truth, and concluded by expressing a sentiment on which M. Isambert subsequently expatiated, and in which we entirely concur, namely, that emancipation was the product of a French idea, nobly and happily realized by the religious philanthropy of England. Rear-Admiral le Ray had the singular good taste to applaud the speech of M. Jollivet. M. Agenor de Gasparin followed in a lengthened and powerful address. He also, like M. de Tocqueville, took a view of the results of British emancipation, during which some member spoke of the outbreak in Dominica, of which it may be enough to say that, to whatever cause it may be referrible, it cannot with any reason be referred to the abolition of slavery. After an episode relating to the transport of slaves from the French to foreign colonies, the main argument was resumed by M. de Castellane, who, whimsically enough, began by declaring himself not an abolitionist, and then framed his whole speech to show how much rather he would see the Government adventuring the great but glorious experiment of immediate abolition, than bringing forward such a half measure as that before the Chamber. After a few words from Messrs. Galos and Le Mercier, the discussion was vigorously concluded by M. Isambert.

Such is a rapid outline of the debate on the general question raised by this *projet de loi*. In the discussion of the several clauses several matters of importance occurred, of which we shall endeavour to give some idea in our next. On the whole we cannot but be gratified with the amount of genuine eloquence and talent thus

devoted to the great cause of human freedom, and with the exalted and noble character of many of the sentiments expressed. In particular, we are pleased with the frank and admirable spirit in which M. de Tocqueville and M. de Gasparin did justice to the results of the English abolition act, and the masterly and energetic manner in which, together with M. Isambert, they contended against that pitiful jealousy of England, of which so influential a use seems to be made by the patrons of slavery. What can it signify, in such a matter, what England has done or wishes France to do? The true honour of France lies, as M. de Gasparin truly affirmed, in being generous and just. We cannot help expressing our regret, however, that the speakers on this occasion have confined their objections to the details of the measure brought forward by the Government, and have either been silent as to its principle, or have given their adhesion to it. We cannot hear without pain M. de Gasparin applaud the hard and essentially unjust principle of self-redemption by the slaves. That emancipation may be effected better than it was effected by England—without apprenticeship, for example—we readily admit; but we cannot allow that it would be any improvement on the English method to make the slaves buy themselves. Immediate and unconditional emancipation is in this matter the path of true wisdom.

We are happy to learn that the proceedings in the French Chambers, being maintained with spirit from day to day, have produced a very deep sensation throughout the kingdom, and done much towards creating a general interest in the subject of the abolition of slavery. We are particularly gratified, also, by the announcement that the slaves belonging to the French Government, amounting to not less than twelve hundred, will, according to a pledge given by the Minister of Marine, be restored to liberty.

By the West India mail we are informed of a few particulars not without interest. The *Falmouth Post*, after discreetly saying, "We dislike Coolie immigration," proceeds to call loudly for the moderate number of thirty thousand of them for Jamaica alone. To pay for this pretty little experiment it proposes to fleece the judges and other functionaries of part of their salaries, and especially to take advantage of the readiness expressed by the English West Indians, at their meeting at Willis's rooms on the 18th of July, to pay a tax upon sugar. We learn by these papers also that a society has been formed in Liverpool, "for improving the agriculture of Jamaica by means of English capital," and that a bill will be brought into the Legislature for conferring some advantages on it. In Barbadoes some shameful proceedings have taken place in the way of kidnapping children under the disguise of free emigration. The crimps in these cases deserve the severest punishment. In Trinidad we have the startling phenomenon of some medical men coming forward for the good of the colony. The peasantry it seems are less apt at taking physic than they ought to be. They have not kept up the subscription of one bit (5d.) per week which many of them paid for several years after emancipation, in order to have medical advice when they were sick. Hence the medical gentlemen tell us there has arisen "a vast increase in the mortality among the labourers," and some estates near Port of Spain, they gravely assure us, "have been decimated," although the *Standard* thinks it strange that nobody had heard of this but the doctors. Out of compassion, however, for the dying peasantry, no less than seven medical gentlemen come forward, and actually present a memorial to the Legislative Council, signed with their respective names, proposing—what do our readers think?—that all "employers should be legally authorised and obliged to retain in their hands 5 per cent. of all wages paid for hired labour" to provide fees for these doctors themselves! As if an act compelling the peasantry to pay the doctors could at the same time compel them to take the physic. The truth is, that here is a set of hungry, if not starving surgeons, who, seeing that they are not useful enough to obtain practice by their merit, want to squeeze an undeserved income out of the hard earnings of the poor by law. The scheme smacks of the olden time. But it will not do. Even the editor of the *Trinidad Standard* thus cautiously gives it the *coup-de-grace* :—

"We have our fears, however applicable to the attainment of the object this proposition may be considered, that it would not be very acceptable to the parties themselves whose benefit is contemplated by it, and that it would fail to realise the effects anticipated 'in restoring confidence and contributing to establish a Christian feeling of mutual dependence between master and servant.' The enactment of a measure of the kind recommended might be considered as coming within the range of what is characterised by some parties as an arbitrary interference with the liberty of the people. To choose one's own doctor, is considered by them as one of the privileges of freedom. They would therefore be inclined to look upon its deprivation as only a step backwards to the condition from which they have been emancipated. They would lose sight of the great advantages that might accrue to them from such a provident provision, in the overwhelming consideration of being deprived of this constituent of freedom, or in the present impression which the enjoyment of robust health would tend to make on their minds, they would be disposed to view it as a hardship, partaking even of a character of an oppressive act of injustice to compel them to pay for the benefit of those who had no natural claim on their support. And need we say that certain parties at a distance, viewing colonial affairs through the distorting medium of old prejudices and present misrepresentation, would see in it the very essence—the very consummation of plantocracy-oppression?"

We give our contemporary credit for his discernment and good sense, and we hope his hints will be enough for those grasping sons of Esculapius in Trinidad. We add only one word of advice. If



they would be called in universally in cases of sickness, let them be to the peasantry more what medical men ought to be, and treat them more nearly as medical men ought to treat their patients. The labourers, no doubt, have only refused to pay for what was not worth the having. It would besides, we think, be an advantage that only those who have medical attendance should be expected to pay for it.

In British Guiana an epidemic has been distressingly prevalent, and, in consequence of the general sickness among the peasantry, an important season has been nearly lost to the planter. The *Guiana Times* makes further references to the intended new batch of ordinances, and affirms that the provisions of the existing vagrant law "are as rigorous as is compatible with human freedom." With regard to a trespass act our contemporary makes the following excellent suggestion:—

"With regard to trespasses, the proprietor of a plantation, or his representative, should not seek to molest any person visiting the occupant of one of his cottages. But he should rail off his side lines, middle-walks, plantain-walks, and so forth, or, at least, erect painted boards cautioning against invasion of these, just as is commonly done in the mother country. The plantation once divided into thoroughfare and privacy, the very fact of being found encroaching on the privacy should constitute an offence. The cultivated produce, natural fruits, and birds and beasts, of a plantation, or lot of land, belong to its proprietor. The enactment of such a trespass-statute would assure his property in these, without a recourse to odious forest-laws or game-laws."

In relation to extending jurisdiction from the stipendiary to the local magistrates, our contemporary uses the following language:—

"We are not used to adulate the stipendiary magistrates. Ignorant, indolent, or corruptible, Heaven knows, they generally are. But there is one mercy; being few in number and dependent on public salary, they do lie under some responsibility of reputation and fortune. But the local gentlemen! Their name is legion. Several of them are unable to spell the English language with accuracy: many are over head and ears in debt, shabby, ragged, seedy-looking parasites of anybody who will give them a dollar or two for doing his dirty work for him. Just fancy such unlettered calves sitting in judgment on misconceptions of the law entertained by their not more stupid fellow-inhabitants; such an insolvent, unincarcerated rogues deciding on evidence of roguery! Should our local gentlemen be entrusted with so much power over the liberties, characters, and monies, of the population, then shall we proclaim to all the world that British Guiana is an excellent settlement—to emigrate from. Lots of land will rise in value in Siberia and Turkey."

In gratifying contrast with this passage we insert another from the same journal highly laudatory of another class of functionaries in the colony, the judges. It is as follows:—

"The fearless impartiality at present evinced by their honours our Judges, in the discharge of their public duties, is calculated to induce the highest degree of confidence in the public mind. All men are equal in the judgment hall. To be an aristocrat, insures no favour—a menial, no frown. In the matter of boedels and minors, their determination is above all praise. The greatest good must result to society. The disgraceful adage, 'Make me your executor, I don't care who's your heir,' must henceforth cease, in application to the hitherto nefarious and iniquitous practices of this province.' This attestation of judicial merit" says the *Times* "we copy from the *Congregational Record*, cordially concurring in every word of it."

THE American mail which was delivered yesterday has brought us an interesting letter from the Rev. A. A. Phelps, of New York, which will be found inserted below. It has brought us also the *Emancipator* of the 8th and 15th instant, containing an account of the great meeting of abolitionists held at Boston on the 1st of the month. The resolutions adopted and the documents issued by this Convention, are of too great length to be inserted to-day, but we insert in another column the brief sketch of the meeting by our contemporary's own pen. We are happy to learn that it was not only a large, but in all respects an important meeting, and likely to be an influential one. We must take further notice of it hereafter. The letter of Mr. Phelps is addressed to Mr. Scoble, and is dated—

"New York, Oct. 14, 1845.

"You will be glad, I doubt not, to hear something by letter concerning our anti-slavery movements and prospects. Of the assault upon freedom of speech and of the press in the person and press of C. M. Clay, Esq., of Kentucky, you are already apprised. His press was sent to Cincinnati, subject to his order. He refused to have anything to do with it, and the city authorities of Lexington sent for it and brought it back. Legal proceedings will probably be commenced against the gentlemen of the mob. Meanwhile Mr. Clay's health is essentially improved, and the first number of the *True American* (revived) has made its appearance. For the present, it is to be printed at Cincinnati, but published and mailed at Lexington. Mr. Clay has lost none of his courage or zeal. He speaks in tones that will stir the hearts of all true men, and cover his persecutors with deserved infamy.

"From the *Reporter* you have also learned the former course of the American Board in respect to the great question. This is the great missionary body of this country. It is sustained by the Congregational, the New School Presbyterian, and the Dutch Reformed Denominations. Up to the present year, though often memorialised on the subject, it has steadily refused to do anything which should assert or imply the sinfulness or moral evil of slavery. On the contrary, it has elected slaveholders as corporate members, employed slaveholders as agents and missionaries, solicited and welcomed the gains of slaveholding, knowing them to be such, to its treasury; and at the same time, not only neglected, but deliberately and repeatedly refused to make any expression of opinion, or adopt any course of action asserting or implying the moral evil of slavery. The last year a

new fact came to light, which was that slaveholders had been and still were welcomed to some of the mission churches,—their slaveholding constituting not only no bar to a final admission, but not even a ground of previous exception, admonition, and remonstrance. This was a state of affairs that multitudes of the supporters of the Board, abolitionists and others, would not endure. The subject, of course, went to a Committee. The Committee reported at the late meeting at Brooklyn. The Report summarily amounts to this.—Slavery, as a system, is a very bad thing, but slaveholding, as an individual relation or practice, is a very harmless affair, by no means inconsistent with the most devoted piety, and an irreproachable character and standing in the Christian church. It leaves the whole matter of the actual practice of slavery just where it was before. It does not enjoin upon the missionaries any steps whatever to bring slaveholding in the mission churches to an end. It does indeed say, that if slaveholders abuse their slaves they should be dealt with. But it does not direct the missionary to take any exception, to give any instruction, to put forth any remonstrance, to call into exercise any processes of discipline, or, in one, to do anything whatever with a view to the speedy or even final termination of slaveholding itself in the mission churches. On the contrary, when, at two successive times, an amendment to the report was offered, the purport of which was, that the missionaries should treat slaveholding, in the matter of instruction, admonition, and discipline, as, and only as, they do drunkenness, falsehood, gaming, theft, adultery, and the like, that amendment was, in one instance, killed in committee, and in the other, directly voted down. Thus stands the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in the middle of the 19th century. The matter will not rest here. It was only the corporate members that were allowed to vote. These are but few. The hundreds of honorary members, who are really the working constituency of the body could not vote. The feeling of dissatisfaction among the churches and ministers in the country at large, out of the cities, is broad and deep; and will yet make itself heard and respected.

"The Great Eastern Convention," as we term it, composed mostly of Liberty Party men, was held at Boston on the 1st inst. It was made up of representatives from the New England states, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It was a noble gathering of true and earnest men. Between one and two thousand were present as members of the convention. I have never attended a larger convention; or met a more substantial and sober-looking body of men. Nor have I ever seen a convention characterized by greater enthusiasm and unanimity. In a word, I never saw the friends of the slave in better mood or better heart. You will see the proceedings in the papers. One of the most important practical measures adopted, was the appointment of a Committee in all of the free states, to circulate and send to Congress, at the opening of its next session, a remonstrance against the admission of Texas as a slave state. As a territory, Texas is practically a part of the Union. But she is not yet admitted as a state. The constitution she has adopted establishes slavery as fully as possible. Admitting her claim to be admitted as a state, she has no claim whatever to admission as a slave state. We mean then to stir the land on this point—to open anew and in earnest the old Missouri question. We hope not to act in vain. At all events, we believe we shall wake up a discussion of the question of slavery or no slavery in Congress, that the slaveholders will be glad to be quit of—the influence of which shall not cease to be felt till the whole system is prostrate.

"The Liberty Party is everywhere in good spirits, and increasing in numbers and strength. Late elections in Vermont and Maine show a decided and cheering advance."

We have received a copy of the new number of the *True American*, referred to by Mr. Phelps. It contains a long and able appeal to the public, written by Mr. Clay; but we must reluctantly postpone the further notice of it to our next.

It will be in the recollection of our readers that, under the recent ordinance for legalizing the importation of Africans into Mauritius, Mr. Sullivan had been despatched on a voyage of discovery along the coast. Under the proper head will be found some particulars of his proceedings and death. At Zanzibar, it appears, the authorities were not favourable to his mission; but on the coast of Mozambique he found, as is alleged, persons free and disposed to emigrate. On Mr. Sullivan's papers, which the Governor has submitted to the Council, and which we should be glad to see submitted to Parliament, the Governor has written a minute, from which also we have given some extracts. Assuming the truth of Mr. Sullivan's statement, (which, we confess, we very much doubt,) he forewarns the Council, with great justice and foresight, that a time will come when these persons will find that money can be made by the kidnapping and sale of men, and that the effect of a system of emigration which may in the first instance be free, may be to create an internal slave-trade where none at present exists. The subject thus opened is of the utmost importance, and we shall wait for further accounts with anxiety.

We have given in another place as copious an abstract as our space will allow of the important proceedings relative to slavery taken at the late annual meeting of the American Board for Foreign Missions.

#### AMERICAN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Our readers are already aware that, at the annual meeting of this Board, recently held at Brooklyn, New York, the subject of slavery was prominently brought forward and largely discussed. The *New York Evangelist* of September the 18th contains an extended account of the proceedings, of which we make as copious an abstract as our space will allow.



The subject was brought up by the presentation of several memorials in relation to it; one from Worcester Central Association, one from Worcester Northern Association, one from the Chautauque County Auxiliary, and one from the Franklin and Somerset County Association. Subsequently a report was brought up from the Committee appointed last year on the same subject. In this report, which is too long for us to give entire, are the following passages, sufficiently expressive of its general tenor.

"The Committee do not deem it necessary to discuss the general subject of slavery, as it exists in the United States, or to enlarge on the wickedness of the system, or on the disastrous moral and social influences which slavery exerts upon the less enlightened and less civilized communities, where the missionaries of the Board are labouring. On these points there is probably, among the members of the Board and its friends, little difference of opinion.

"The unrighteousness of the principles on which the whole system is based, and the violation of the natural rights of man, the debasement, wickedness, and misery it involves, and which are, in fact, witnessed to a greater or less extent, wherever it exists, must call forth the hearty condemnation of all possessed of Christian feeling and sense of right, and makes its entire and speedy removal an object of earnest and prayerful desire to every true friend of God and man.

"Strongly as your Committee are convinced of the wrongfulness and evil tendencies of slaveholding, and ardently as they desire its speedy and universal termination, they still cannot think that in all cases individual guilt exists in such a manner that every person implicated in it can on Scriptural grounds be excluded from Christian fellowship. In the language of Dr. Chalmers, when treating on this point in a recent letter—the Committee would say, 'Distinction ought to be made between the character of a system and the character of the persons whose circumstances have implicated them with it. Nor would it always be just if all the recoil and horror wherewith the former is contemplated, were visited in the form of condemnation and moral indignancy upon the latter.'

"Dr. Chalmers proceeds to apply this distinction to the subject now under consideration in the following manner, to which sentiments substantially Drs. Candlish and Cunningham, with the whole General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, unanimously concurred: 'Slavery,' says he, 'we hold to be a system chargeable with atrocities and evils, often the most hideous and appalling, which have either afflicted or deformed our species. Yet we must not therefore say of every man born within its territory, who has grown up familiar with its sickening spectacles, and not only by his habits been enured to its transactions and sights, but who by inheritance is himself the owner of slaves, that unless he make the resolute sacrifice and renounce his property in slaves, he is therefore not a Christian—and should be treated as an outcast from all the distinctions and privileges of Christian society.'

"Such substantially are the views of your Committee, and the more they study God's method of proceeding in regard to war, slavery, polygamy, and other kindred social wrongs, as it is unfolded in the Bible, the more they are convinced that in dealing with individuals implicated in these wrongs of long standing, and intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system, the utmost kindness and forbearance are to be exercised, which are compatible with steady adherence to right principles."

On the reading of this report a prolonged discussion ensued, which was from sitting to sitting adjourned, so as to be allowed to occupy—such was the general sense of its importance—by far the larger part of the three days allotted to the meeting of the Board. The Rev. A. A. Phelps, of New York, concluded his speech by moving an amendment, for the insertion of which we have not room. At a later period of the proceedings the Rev. Dr. Bacon moved also the following resolutions, as a further amendment on the report:—

"In conclusion, it seems proper for the Board, on this occasion, to put upon record a distinct assertion of the principles contained in the following resolutions.

"1.—Resolved, That inasmuch as the system of domestic slavery, under every modification, is at war with the principles of Christianity, with natural justice, with industry and thrift, with habits of subjection to law, and with whatever tends to the advancement of civilisation and the ascendancy of the gospel, and inasmuch as it brings upon every community which establishes and upholds it, the righteous displeasure of God, and the reprobation of the civilised and Christian world, the existence of slavery in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations is deeply to be lamented by their friends, and particularly by this Board, as having been, for more than a quarter of a century, engaged in labours tending to their moral, intellectual, and social advancement.

"2.—Resolved, That while the strongest language of reprobation is not too strong to be applied to the system of slavery, truth and justice require this Board to say that the relation of a master to one whom the constitution of society has made a slave, is not to be regarded as in all cases such a sin as to require the exclusion of the master, without further inquiry, from Christian ordinances.

"3.—Resolved, That the missionaries of this Board, everywhere, are expected to admit to Christian ordinances those, and only those, who give satisfactory evidence of having become new creatures in Christ.

"4.—Resolved, That the master who buys and sells human beings, as merchandise, for gain—who does not recognise in respect to his servants the divine sanctity of their relations, as husbands and wives, and as parents and children—who permits them to live and die in ignorance of God, and of God's word, who does not render to his servants that which is just and equal, or who refuses to recognise, heartily and practically, their dignity and worth, as reasonable and animated beings, for whom Christ has died, does not give satisfactory evidence of being born of God, or having the spirit of Christ."

After full discussion both the report and the amendments were referred to a special committee appointed by the chair; and this body ultimately recommended that the report should be adopted in

its original form. To this recommendation an amendment was moved by the Rev. A. A. Phelps, to the following effect:—

"And finally, in accordance with, and in reply to, the memorials submitted to it from Worcester county and elsewhere at its present meeting, the Board deem it right and proper to say, that its funds cannot and will not be expended in maintaining slaveholding missionaries, or building up slaveholding churches; that in carrying out the general principles laid down in the first part of the foregoing report, in their practical application to the question of receiving slaveholders to, and retaining them in, the missionary churches, the Board will expect its missionaries and churches to treat slaveholding, in the matter of instruction, admonition and discipline, in the same manner as they should and would treat drunkenness, gaming, falsehood, bigamy, idolatry, and the like; and that whenever and wherever it shall appear that the missionaries and the churches, in the exercise of their appropriate liberty, do not do so, it will be the duty of this Board, in the exercise of its liberty to dissolve farther connection with them."

This amendment was negatived; after which the recommendation of the Committee was adopted. It appears that only the corporate members of the Board are entitled to vote; and of these seventy-five voted in favour of the motion, and none against it. How many corporate members were present at the meeting is not stated; nor indeed does it appear how many there are in the Board. The following speeches which were delivered after the recommendation of the Special Committee was brought up, will show how the question was finally left.

"Rev. Dr. Tappan, of Augusta, Me., said that every individual of the Committee approved of the principles of Dr. Bacon's resolutions; but it was feared that to append them to the report would look too much like legislation, and might seem to ecclesiastical bodies that the Board was trenching upon their proper province. There are, also, other substantial reasons; and though the report was believed to contain every principle in the resolutions, it was unadvisable to state them in this formal manner.

"Rev. J. C. Webster, from the Committee, was obliged, with great reluctance, to differ from his colleagues. It was from no want of attachment to the Board; on the contrary, it was because he loved the Board, and because he desired this perplexing question to be settled in such a way as to promote harmony of feeling, that he could not assent to the report as it is. He should have been satisfied with Dr. Bacon's resolutions; and if all the principles of the resolutions were contained in the report, he saw no good reason why they should not be frankly summed up at the close. This would have satisfied all parties. As it is, he feared that a large number of the Board's best friends would not be satisfied. The general impression will be, that although slavery is condemned, there is a loop-hole left for all who love to hold slaves.

"Rev. Dr. Hawes, of Hartford, remarked that he should have forborne any remarks on the subject, except that his well-known position as an abolitionist—a name he hoped he might bear so long as he lived—would seem to require a statement of his views. As regards the main principles of the report, I have, said he, no difficulty at all. They have my cordial approbation. The report is right, in admitting that the subject of slavery, coming as it does directly across our path, is a fit and proper subject for the consideration of this Board.

"The report is right also in disclaiming all jurisdiction over the internal regimen of the mission churches: at the same time claiming authority to appropriate its funds for the support of only such missionaries and churches as it sees fit.

"It is right in that it comes out with full, bold, and righteous condemnation of slavery. I am glad it does not blink that question. It calls it by its right name—it is an atrocious system of wrong, and an abomination in the sight of God. It admits of no apology. Yet it is such a sin, and the circumstances in which it exists are such, that a man may practise it, and be comparatively innocent. We are not to decide at once that every participant of the evil is necessarily guilty of oppression. It raises a presumption of a man's guilt, but does not necessarily decide it.

"The report is right in asserting that the only proper condition of church-membership is evidence of true piety, and that the missionaries are the proper judges as to what that evidence is. It is a principle which I shall hold to so long as I acknowledge the authority of the New Testament, that we are never to exclude from the Lord's table any who give evidence of being the friends of Christ. It is a principle which I adopted twenty-five years ago: and but for the force with which it has held me, I should never have warped into the harbour where I find myself now. I can never subscribe to a principle which will shut out from the church of Christ any man who gives good evidence of a change of heart.

"The report might have been more complete in some particulars. When speaking of the principles on which missions should be conducted, I should be glad if there were a clause, stating that it is not to be understood that this institution is to be permanent; but the gospel is to be so preached as to eradicate it in the briefest possible time. The great unhappiness with the churches at the South is, that the gospel is so preached there that it has no tendency to destroy the system, but rather to screen and perpetuate it. The gospel is at utter war with the system; and if preached in honesty, or at all in accordance with its true spirit and intent, it must necessarily put an end to it. This ought to be everywhere understood; and the report ought to have adopted it as one of its fundamental positions. We are not always to have slavery among us; nor shall we have, if the gospel only has fair play.

"I could have wished, too, that the important distinction between social and personal sins had been enlarged upon. It is one of great value.

"But the report was made upon the principle of concession. There are conflicting views, honestly entertained, relative to many of the minor points of this question. If we can agree on the main principles, I do not fear the result with our sober, thinking, Christian community. I am ready to take the report as it is, and am satisfied that it will be well received, and on the whole, harmonise the different shades of opinion as much as any document possibly could do."



## UNITED STATES—ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION AT BOSTON.

PURSUANT to a call for the purpose, a convention of the friends of freedom in the Eastern and Middle States, assembled in the Tremont Temple, in the City of Boston, on Wednesday the 1st day of October, 1845.

The following spirited sketch of the meeting is given in the *Emancipator*—

## THE GREAT CONVENTION.

It was a noble meeting. Large numbers of the most worthy citizens assembled. Rarely is a mass meeting to be found embracing so much sterling weight of character. We missed Alvan Stewart, Beriah Green, W. L. Chaplin, and some others were hoped to attend, and above all, the noble Birney. But there were enough to satisfy all reasonable desires. The people came to deliberate more than to listen to enthusiastic appeals. The speeches were of that character, not so rhetorical as argumentative, befitting the occasion and the weighty questions before us.

General Fessenden presided, to everybody's satisfaction. No man could have preserved better order, or held a more complete control of the elements, amid all sorts of excitements. His opening speech on taking the chair, was very happy, and his conclusion in reply to the enthusiastic vote of thanks, pre-eminently gratifying. He said he deemed it a higher honour to have presided over such a convention to its satisfaction, than to have been elected president of the United States—by either of the pro-slavery parties. No man doubted that he felt what he said. The interest of the meeting increased to the end, and the meeting on Friday evening was admitted to be the best of all.

Delia Webster was there, and her case was explained, by the Rev. Mr. Day, in a manner which told much to the disadvantage of the "chivalry" of Kentucky, and the whiggery of Vermont. Walker was there, a part of the time; and the resolutions of sympathy for Torrey and the other sufferers, were cordial and earnest.

The "Unconstitutionality of Slavery" was the chief subject of discussion, though the "organic sins" question was fairly examined and set in striking light. The proceedings of the American Board, and the novel and alarming doctrines there brought forward, are producing a powerful sensation; while Spooner's book on the constitution is opening the eyes of many to see how long they have been humbugged by the slaveholders to believe that the law of the land, in a free country, sustains slavery.

## SURINAM.

(From the *Western Times*.)

We drew attention a short time since to the conduct of the authorities of the Dutch colony at Surinam, towards the British Commissioner, E. W. H. Schenley, Esq. We have this week received a copy of the *Guiana Times*, which affords further illustration of the arbitrary and tyrannical conduct of these wretched slave owners. It appears from the statement of the able editor of that paper, that a Mr. J. B. Smith, an Englishman, being in Surinam with some musicians engaged in giving musical performances, happened to arouse the suspicions and incur the brutality of these people in rather a curious way. He had received a letter from a correspondent in Demerara, who detailing the chit-chat of the place, said that a general rising of all the emancipated peasants of the West Indies was anticipated by some of the croakers of the day. Mr. Smith being at dinner, referred to this as a topic of conversation, but so incidentally, that the subject was very soon changed, and the matter wholly forgotten by him. The terrors of the Dutch slave-owners were however excited, and information was given to the *Procureur* of the Island, of the incendiary letter which Mr. Smith had upon his person. The *Procureur*, a sort of low Dutch Attorney-General, demanded an inspection of the letter. Mr. Smith standing on his rights as a man, refused to surrender his private correspondence; and the colonial authorities immediately had him arrested and plunged into gaol. The jail is a filthy place, provided by Dutch slave-owners, for the terror and restraint of their unhappy victims. Having Mr. Smith now in their power, his papers were seized and ransacked; the unfortunate letter was seized and detained, and the unhappy owner was then thrust out of jail. These facts the Editor of the *Guiana Times* states that he received, not from Mr. Smith himself, but from an English gentleman, who was in Surinam at the time; but he questions whether Lord Aberdeen will have courage to grapple with them, as he ought, both out of respect to the feelings of humanity, and the dignity of the national character.

The pusillanimity of the councils in the Foreign Office is tolerably well understood by the West Indians, and the Dutch evidently presume upon it. Speaking of the state of affairs in Surinam, the *Guiana Times* apprehends increased ill-usage to the negro population there; and he pays the following well-merited compliment to the gallant and generous protector of the negroes, Mr. Commissioner Schenley, the consequence of whose absence from the colony he justly deems to be most important.

"We anticipate the immediate receipt of a deplorable account of matters there. Mr. Elias, the governor, who showed some inclination to protect the negro, has been recalled. Mr. Schenley, the British Commissioner, who was a check upon the slave-mongers, has gone to Europe, and, should he ever return to Surinam, two sentences for large amounts of damages for defamation, said defamation having been contained in his despatches to the foreign secretary of state of his own government, await him. His despatches were forwarded to the address, and designed for the eye of Lords Palmerston and Aberdeen. Her majesty's government thought proper to lay them, or a portion of them before parliament. This, according to the right construction of the law of libel, amounts to no publication upon Mr. Schenley's part. But what sort of justice is to be expected from a corrupt tribunal in a society of debased slavemongers. It is not the vindication of character that is aimed at, but the expulsion of a troublesome and formidable spy, a person of more than ordinary discernment, very rare courage, and recklessness of personal consequences. This is apparent from the circumstance that although the Commissioner's approaching departure was well known throughout the colony, no attempt was made to compel him to give security for the result. The planters were only too well pleased to get him out of the way, and the sentences for defamation will only be

useful implements of intimidation and menace, should he ever evince an inclination to return. Should he not return, just let the friends of humanity compute the chances of a fearless and impartial discharge of duty by any person who may be appointed to succeed him, even if a man of the same strong nerve and indomitable temper. Nothing can reflect higher discredit on Lord Aberdeen's administration of foreign affairs, than the satisfaction with which the Dutch slavemongers regard the discouragement and disfavour which his lordship has shown towards the English Commissioner. Some of them have the insolence to allege that his lordship will and can do nothing in behalf of the unjustly detained slaves, because, forsooth, the emperor of Russia, the brother-in-law of the king of Holland, has, (we must admit, in a manner characteristic of the oppression of the Poles,) thrown his huge weight into the scale adverse to the liberties of man."

## Colonial Intelligence.

JAMAICA.—FRACAS BETWEEN THE NATIVE LABOURERS AND THE COOLIES.—A Coolie standing in the mill-yard of Dank's estate, was hurt in the foot by a native, who was passing, wilfully, as is said, causing his horse to tread upon it. As may be expected, the Coolie got irritated, and resented the assault; but the native was assisted by three or four of his countrymen, and three or four Coolies, on seeing this, went, in like manner, to the assistance of their brother. A "skirmish" of no ill result whatever, took place between these parties, who used the canes lying about as their weapons. After this was over, the offended Coolie went to the headman to complain of the treatment he had received from him who caused his horse to tread upon his foot, and the headman proceeded in quest of the delinquent, for the purpose, as is alleged, of taking him before the overseer, as usual in all such cases. He fled, however, and took refuge in a house, into which he refused to allow the headman to come. This house was then gradually surrounded both by Coolies and by natives, the one party calling for justice for the wanton injury done to the Coolie, the other protecting the delinquent from the headman's interference. The excitement increased with the extent of the mob, and ultimately a regular row ensued, in which one Coolie was slightly wounded on the head with a cutlass, two or three others sustained some bruises, and their party was beaten off. An investigation into the matter was immediately held, and continued with the greatest patience during four days, when the magistrates, under the above circumstances, sent the case on for trial at the ensuing assizes.—*Jamaica Times*.

MAURITIUS.—IMMIGRATION FROM AFRICA.—The *Watchman* gives the following account of the voyage of discovery made by Mr. Sullivan on behalf of the Mauritian Government.—"After leaving this port the brig went direct to Zanzibar, where the authorities were not disposed to promote the object of the mission. Mr. Sullivan therefore took two interpreters who spoke the languages of the natives on the Mozambique coast, and sailed thither. He touched at several ports, and not only did he find no obstacles in the way of procuring labourers, but hundreds were ready, on the representations of the interpreters, to embark with him; indeed, many were quite importunate to be taken on board, and there were no constituted authorities there who had either will or power to prevent them. But Mr. Sullivan could not, of course, accede to their request, for his mission was not to bring men, but only to ascertain if they could be procured; and, besides, as he could not have obtained a clearance from villages in which there were no constituted authorities, he would have been liable to have been taken as a slaver." The notes of Mr. Sullivan have subsequently been laid before the Council, with a minute from the Governor, from which we extract the following passages:—

"June 13th, 1845.

"I lay before the Council a summary of information reduced from the papers of a gentleman, as respectable as he was regretted, who some months ago was deputed by the local government, in concert with the Council, on a mission to the eastern coast of Africa, with the object of determining whether it was possible to import free labour from any point of that extensive line of coast, and of indicating the means of rendering it available.

"The Council will be convinced by the perusal of these papers, that the enquiries of Mr. Sullivan led him to the conclusion, that free labourers were procurable at one of the ports at which he touched, while he at the same time very specifically states that it will be necessary to act with as much caution as ability in conducting the negotiations which we shall have to establish with these African communities.

"The Council will have to consider if, in the actual state of the colony, and under the operation of the present regulations with regard to immigration, it will be of advantage to give effect to this plan; and it will also have maturely to reflect on the conditions which will allow the local government to recommend it for the Royal sanction.

"The establishment of an accredited agent in such ports as may be opened to African emigration will be indispensable, since the character, however honourable, of the individuals who will be engaged in the importation of these emigrants from their country to the Mauritius, cannot of itself be considered as a sufficient guarantee against fraud.

"It will further be necessary to provide for the time when the lust of gold will be awakened among tribes who, at the best, only half-civilised, will find themselves thus all at once, in a position to gain wealth, and we must also be prepared for the case, when the relations established, after having been at first contracted in perfect good faith, and entire liberty on the side of the Africans, will degenerate into a system of constraint, if not of traffic, in despite of the vigilance and efforts of our responsible agent to repress it."

The task of reporting upon the evidence of Mr. Sullivan has devolved on the Committee of Immigration.

Printed by WILLIAM TYLER, of 25, Duncan-terrace, Islington, in the county of Middlesex, printer, and CHARLES REED, of Cambridge-heath, Hackney, in the said county of Middlesex, printer, at their printing-office, No. 5, Bolt-court, Fleet-street, in the parish of St. Dunstan-in-the-West in the city of London; and published by LANCELOT WILD, of No. 13, Catherine-street, in the parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, in the county of Middlesex, publisher, at 13, Catherine-street, Strand, as aforesaid. Wednesday, October 29, 1845.